

(b) The Tahsildar was not threatened on the very night of the incident but on 28th December 1975 he was threatened by some persons not to raid houses of rice smugglers who smuggled rice from Raichur to Maharashtra.

(c) A case in Sadar Bazar Police Station has been registered and the same is under investigation.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Minister for Industries and Parliamentary Affairs on behalf of the Chief Minister) I beg to lay —

The Karnataka Public Service Commission (Consultation) Regulation, 1976 as required by clause (5) of article 329 of the Constitution of India.

MADAM SPEAKER.—The Regulation is laid.

Statement by the Minister for Industries and Parliamentary Affairs.

re :—Correction in replies to starred Question No. 49.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Minister for Industries and Parliamentary Affairs).—While furnishing replies to the L&Q No. 49 by Sri C. Byregowda, M.L.A., the Chief Minister has stated that Sri M. M. Kharge, Chairman, Karnataka Leatherbased Industries Board has been receiving a salary or an honorarium of Rs. 1,000 p.m. vide Sl. No. 5 of the Statement. This is not correct. Sri Kharge is not in receipt of any salary or honorarium. I deeply regret the mistake which has crept in inadvertently. Sri M. M. Kharge being a sitting M.L.A. is not entitled to receive any salary or honorarium under Govt. Order No. 39/75 dated 9th June 1975. I am sorry for the wrong information furnished to the House. I would further say that it was not deliberate nor was it intended to mislead the House. I would also express my apology to the hon. member Sri Kharge and to this Hon'ble. House for this lapse.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇವತ್ತು ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಆಯಿತು ಆದರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಬೇರೆ ಇದೆ. ತಾವು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಾಗದ ಬರೆಯಬೇಕು. ಇದನ್ನು ಅಪೊಡಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರ್ಪಡೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. I hope you would follow the procedure in future.

Taking up Excess Grants after presentation of the report of the public Accounts Committee Procedure for

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN (Malleswaram).—Before the Finance Minister takes up the question of voting of Demands for Excess grants relating to the financial year 1970-71. I have a point of order. Rule No. 17 of the Rules of Procedure says—

“Supplementary, additional, excess, and exceptional grants and votes of credit shall be regulated by the same procedure as is applicable in the case of demands for grants subject to such adaptations, whether by way of modification, addition or omission as the Speaker may deem to be necessary or expedient.”

According to this rule, the Minister can come forward for discussion and voting of excess grant, additional grant and supplementary grants. Probably there is no rule saying that he can come forward for a discussion on voting of demands for grants relating to the year 1970-71. Voting on supplementary demands for 75-76 is understandable. I would ask the Finance Minister as to why all these days this has not been brought forward before this House (grants relating to 1970-71). We are already five years behind. Why he has brought forward these demands after a lapse of 5 years? I do not know whether it would be proper for this House to discuss this question. My own feeling is that since we have already discussed the demands during the budget sessions of 72, 73, 74, and 75, this should not be permitted at all by the Speaker. In this connection I would also like to refer to the Practice of Procedure in the Parliament by Sri M.N. Kaul and Shekhdar *vide* page 564 which says—

“Demands for money already spent in excess of voted grant should not be made by way of supplementary grant but in the form of excess grant. Demands for excess grant must be brought before the House.” I would like to know whether it has come to the notice of the Government the excess amount after 5 years. Though it might have come to the notice of the Government earlier, I am afraid they have failed in their duty and they did not bring it before the House and the Hon’ble Finance Minister is now reopening the whole thing. The notice of the Government is different from the notice of the Hon’ble Minister Sri Ghorpade. He was the Finance Minister last year and he was also the Finance Minister in the year previous to that. I want to know whether he came to know of it only now or whether he did not come to know of it earlier and if so, why? According to May’s Parliamentary Practice the practice in Britain is that spending in excess of the grants originally voted is a serious breach of financial discipline and the Department in

question will have to answer for its conduct to the Treasury. Here, the voting of Demands for Excess Grants relating to the financial year 1970-71 has now come up before the House. We cannot permit it.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ೧೭ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ ೧೯೭೫ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್‌ಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಹೌಸ್‌ಗೆ ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ ೨೧ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ೧೯೭೬ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ they have asked some of these things to be got regularised. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಟೈಂ ಪೇಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ ಎಸ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್.—ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದು ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವಾಗ ಬಂತು ಎಂದು. ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕ್ಯಸ್ ಸ್ಟೆಂಡಾಗಿದೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಬಂದತ್ತಕ್ಷಣ ತಮಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು. They have failed in their duties. They are bringing it to our notice now.

Sri M. Y. GHORPADE.—Madam, if I might explain, it is a very simple thing. There is a procedure laid down for this purpose. As the hon'ble member knows there are two types of grants for which we have to come before the House: one consists of the grants in excess of the budget which we notice during the financial year. We come before the House in the shape of supplementaries. Apart from this, it may be that in a particular year the actual amount spent is more than what the House has voted. This does not immediately come to the notice of the Government. There is a procedure laid down for this purpose. It has to be audited by the Comptroller and Auditor-General and then the Public Accounts Committee goes into the audited accounts and at that time it goes into the excess of expenditure over the budgeted amount for a previous year and then it tries to see whether this is a normal excess. Therefore, we have to await the report of the Public Accounts Committee on such excess payment and that report is placed before the house. Then the House will have the benefit of the scrutiny of the Public Accounts Committee and this whole process of audit and examination by the Public Accounts Committee of a previous years, accounts invariably takes some time. It may even take two to three years. As you, Madam, rightly pointed out, as soon as the Public Accounts Committee submits the report, it is placed before the House and therefore there is no question of any deliberate or inadvertent delay on the part of the Government or of the legislature.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಾಗೋಡು ತಿಮ್ಮಪ್ಪ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಅರ್ಥ ಇದೆ. ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ವರದಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಮೇಲೆ ರೆಕ್ವಿಜೈ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಅರ್ಥದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ "As soon as it immediately comes to the Notice of the Government" ಎಂದು ಇದೆ.

SRI M. S. KRISHNAN.—The Demands for Excess Grants must be brought before the House as soon as the excess comes to the notice of the Government. I agree that the PAC goes through it and comes

to certain conclusions. After going through it, may pass on strictures or criticisms. That is another matter. The point is, even prior to that when the Government came to know of it, did it bring it to the notice of the House? Or at least immediately after the Public Accounts Committee examined it, was this brought to the notice of this House?

MADAM SPEAKER.—Expenditure in excess of the voted grants is not therefore made by way of supplementary grants but in the form of excess grants and the demands for excess grants have to be presented to the House in the session in which the Public Accounts Committee presents its reports thereon or in the following session. The Hon'ble Finance Minister may now move the demands for excess grants.

DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS RELATING TO THE FINANCIAL YEAR 1970-71

Demand No: 5,7,8,10,17,18,21,22,25,29,30,31,32,37,40,41,43 45 and 52
SRI. M. Y. GHORPADE :— (Minister for Finance and Housing) Madam Speaker, I beg to move :

“That the sum of Rs. 3,95,566, be granted to Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants for the year 1970-71 in respect of Demand No. 5 Sales Tax Administration

MADAM SPEAKER.— Motion is deemed to have been moved, I will put all the Demands to the vote. The question is :

“That the sum be granted to Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants for the year 1970-71 in respect of Demand No: 5,7,8,10,17,18,21,22,25,29,30,31,32,37,40,41, 43,45 and 52.”

The motion was adopted and the sums were granted.

As ordered by the chair the motion to cover expenditure incurred in excess of voted grants, adopted by the house are reproduced below :

DEMAND NO. 5.—SALES TAX ADMINISTRATION

“That the sum of Rs. 3,95,566 be granted to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants for the year 1970-71 in respect of Demand No. 5 Sales Tax Administration.”

DEMAND NO. 7.—STAMPS

“That the sum of Rs. 1,42,415 be granted to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants for the year 1970-71 in respect of Demand No. 7 stamps.”